DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 960 HE 032 668

AUTHOR	Ginorio, Angela B.; Romer, Nancy; Unger, Rhoda K.; Wyche, Karen Fraser
TITLE	Psychology. CUNY Panel: Rethinking the Disciplines. Women in the Curriculum Series.
INSTITUTION	Towson Univ., Baltimore, MD. National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women.
SPONS AGENCY	Ford Foundation, New York, NY.; Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
ISBN	ISBN-1-885303-14-9
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	56p.; For related documents in this series, see HE 032 663-689.
AVAILABLE FROM	Towson University, 8000 York Road, Baltimore, MD 21252; Tel: 800-847-9922 (Toll Free); Fax: 410-830-3482; Web site: http://www.towson.edu/ncctrw ($10).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Curriculum; *College Instruction; Ethnicity; Females; Feminism; *Feminist Criticism; Higher Education; Multicultural Education; Psychological Studies; Psychologists; *Psychology; Race; *Sex Bias; *Sex Fairness; Sexual Identity; Social Class; Teaching Methods; Textbook Bias; Theories
IDENTIFIERS	Gender Issues

ABSTRACT

This collection of four essays examines the ways in which psychology, as a discipline, reflects ongoing scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, social class, and sexual orientation. In "Rethinking the Discipline: Psychology," Angela B. Ginorio focuses on the inadequacies of many existing courses and textbooks. She also explores specific psychological issues as they affect Latinas. In "The Impact of the New Scholarship on Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Social Class, and Sexual Orientation on Psychology," Nancy Romer addresses the significant positive changes that have occurred in the field over the last several years. In "A Just Noticeable Difference: The Impact of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Social Class on Psychology," Rhoda K. Unger notes that introductory psychology textbooks remain ethnocentric and androcentric and discusses the effects of feminist scholarship on the field. In "Scholarship and the Discipline: The Study of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Social Class, and Sexual Orientation," Karen Fraser Wyche examines the interrelationships between research findings, journal publications, and curriculum. Each essay contains references. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 432 960

PSYCHOLOGY

CUNY Panel:
Rethinking the Discipline

HE032668

WOMEN in the CURRICULUM

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Women in the Curriculum

PSYCHOLOGY

CUNY Panel:

Rethinking the Disciplines

Angela B. Ginorio
University of Washington

Nancy Romer
Brooklyn College, CUNY

Rhoda K. Unger
Montclair State College

Karen Fraser Wyche
New York University,
School of Social Work

National Center for
Curriculum Transformation
Resources on Women
1997

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
Institute for Teaching and Research on Women
Towson University
8000 York Road
Baltimore, MD 21252
Phone: (410) 830-3944
Fax: (410) 830-3469
E-mail: ncctrw@towson.edu
http://www.towson.edu/ncctrw

Copyright © 1997
National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
Reprint of "The CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Science: Rethinking the Disciplines," 1994.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women.

The National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women is partially supported by grants from The Ford Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, whose support is gratefully acknowledged. The viewpoints expressed herein, however, do not necessarily reflect those of the funding agencies.

Printed on recycled paper by Uptown Press, Baltimore, MD

ISBN 1-885303-14-9

CONTENTS

Preface v

Rethinking the Discipline: Psychology 1
Angela B. Ginorio

The Impact of the New Scholarship on Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Social Class, and Sexual Orientation on Psychology 10
Nancy Romer

A Just Noticeable Difference: The Impact of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Social Class on Psychology 18
Rhoda K. Unger

Scholarship and the Discipline: The Study of Gender, Ethnicity, Social Class and Sexual Orientation 31
Karen Fraser Wyche

Contributors 38

PREFACE

In 1992–1994 the SEMINAR ON SCHOLARSHIP AND THE CURRICULUM: THE STUDY OF GENDER, RACE, ETHNICITY, AND CLASS, under the aegis of the **City University of New York Academy for the Humanities and the Sciences**, and generously funded by the Ford Foundation, undertook a series of meetings devoted to "Rethinking the Disciplines." The Academy Seminar had already spent four years examining ways in which the study of gender, race, ethnicity, and class has been slowly transforming the curriculum of the university. Panels had explored women's studies, ethnic studies, area studies, interdisciplinary studies, pedagogical issues, and teaching about such topics as AIDS. The Academy Seminar has involved faculty at CUNY who are members of the CUNY Academy, faculty, students, and administrators interested in these specific issues, and faculty who have themselves taken part in one of the several curriculum transformation projects within CUNY beginning in the 1980s.*

* Two curriculum projects, funded by the Muskawini Foundation, were introduced at Hunter College, in 1983 among those teaching introductory courses and in 1985 among faculty in the professional schools (Health Sciences, Nursing, and Social Work). Two more projects were undertaken with the sponsorship of the Center for the Study of Women and Society, with grants from the Ford Foundation, one for the Community Colleges and one to Integrate Materials on Women of Color into the Senior College Curriculum. Four semester-long curriculum seminars for faculty involved in vocational education in the Community and Technical Education

It was timely, therefore, that in its fifth year the Academy Seminar should ask directly how much the introduction of this new scholarship, its theory and impact on the curriculum, had actually affected the pursuit of various disciplines in institutions of higher education. The seven areas targeted—Literature, History, Sociology, Biology, Psychology, Anthropology, and Education—represent scholarly arenas in which a great deal of "theory" has been produced, new journals have proliferated, and considerable activity has occurred under many aegises to identify, explicate, and disseminate the transformed perspectives thus formulated. There is now no lack of materials, no absence of theoretical frameworks, no question of the level of sophistication and argumentation, and no dearth of pedagogical analyses demonstrating the importance of these new methodological approaches, this new knowledge base.

For PSYCHOLOGY, each panelist was asked to consider these issues from a set of questions framed to bring forward what is happening from her perspective in the discipline. These questions probe the ways Psychology as a discipline currently reflects ongoing scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class: Have the ways the field is conceptualized undergone any radical changes? Are there any shifts in the ways theory and research are taught to graduate students in this field? Have there been changes in the way introductory textbooks explain the field? And

---

colleges within CUNY, funded by the New York State Department of Education's Program for Sex Equity, took place from 1987 to 1991, and eight year-long Faculty Development Seminars, under the aegis of the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs, were offered from 1987 to 1995 for Balancing the Curriculum for Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class. The CUNY Academy Seminar on Scholarship and the Curriculum: The Study of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class has been in existence since 1988.

if little major change is reflected in these areas, in the light of so much new scholarship, what has been the source of resistance to change in the practice of the field? Finally, we have sought to probe the ways new knowledge has affected teaching in the classroom. These papers are the answers to these questions by the panelists who discussed them November 29, 1993.

Dorothy O. Helly

Series Editor

November 29, 1993

PSYCHOLOGY

Rethinking the Discipline: Psychology

Angela B. Ginorio

It has been said that if one wants to change social realities in a nonviolent way, one must have stories and one must have numbers. I assume that this engagement of rethinking the discipline of psychology has a strong agenda of change. I would like to share with you three stories and, as would be expected of any social psychologist deserving that name—and wanting to effect social change—these stories come with their corresponding set of numbers.

Ford Project

If I had not already heard Naomi Weisstein deliver her "Naomi in Wonderland" lecture in 1972, I may have called this story "Angela in Wonderland." Instead, I'll call the first story: "X plus Y plus Z plus one equals one." This story describes what happened when the Ford Foundation established an initiative intended to facilitate the incorporation of existing scholarship about women of color into the undergraduate liberal arts curriculum. Beginning in 1989 the Foundation sponsored a national curriculum change project: "Incorporating American Ethnic Minority Women into the Curriculum." Eleven projects were funded between 1988 and 1990 covering thirty-three campuses.

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

Seven hundred and sixteen faculty members participated in the faculty development training provided by these projects, including psychologists. After extensive training on the scholarship on and by women of color, each of those faculty members was expected to revise at least one of their courses.

I was involved in the evaluation of this national initiative (Ginorio, Butler, Schmitz, & Conte, 1992). The evaluation included pre- and post-training surveys, a rating of the revised syllabus compared to the original syllabus of the course being transformed, and interviews of a subset of participants. As I visited these campuses, I noted two things: how few psychologists were involved and how often the stories of resistance to participation involved psychologists.

In evaluating syllabi, ratings were made of 102 of the 700 plus syllabi, including eighteen from Psychology. To get the highest rating, a revised syllabus had to include the following:

- at least two changes in the course (such as adding a text or unit on women of color);
- more than 10 percent of the revised course syllabus focuses on women of color; and
- additions are not of the add-and-stir variety.

By any account these are modest goals; yet only two of the evaluated courses in psychology got the highest rating, while three of the courses had *no* change. Two courses, in fact, were worse after the revision than before because their attempts at inclusion increased stereotypes. Fourteen of the eighteen psychology courses had less than 10 percent of content on women of color. These results are *after* the faculty training had occurred. In a rank-ordering of six

disciplines (History, English/Literature, Psychology, Other Social Sciences, Interdisciplinary Studies/Women Studies, Ethnic Studies, American Studies, and Science), Psychology comes next to last, right above Science.

Why should psychology, which is a discipline focused on explaining the behavior of all human beings, do so poorly in this rating? The content of the interviews with faculty members provided some insights into this dismal state of affairs. "Psychology courses are service courses," we were told. "We teach large numbers of students and must rely on existing textbooks," was another explanation given.

As we all know, existing textbooks are dismal when it comes to inclusion of most people in the world! Every year a new review comes out providing good documentation of how textbooks in a given field of psychology do not reflect a psychology of all people. Last year, for example, Padilla and Lindholm (1992), in a review of two popular texts in developmental psychology, found very little mention of issues for children of color beyond the typical discussion on IQ differences between white and African-American children. In an informal review that I conducted last year of the textbooks in introductory psychology used at my university, we found that not only was the inclusion of information about people of color very limited, in a couple of cases it had even gone down from an earlier edition! Most psychology of women textbooks have been equally lacking in their inclusion of knowledge about women of color (Brown, Goodwin, Hall, & Jackson-Lowman, 1985).

One may conclude that no matter what kinds and levels of information are available, the addition of X, Y, and Z to the typical psychology course still equals one. In the words of Bond (1988) that *one* consists of "white male

middle class citizens of the United States." Occasionally there is also mention of "variations from the 'norm.'" People of color, women, poor people, people with disabilities, gays and lesbians, and the elderly are among those presented as variations from the "norm."

What *is* out there as to scholarship about people other than white male middle class citizens of the United States? This question brings me to my second story entitled: "Now I see you, Now I don't!"

Psychological Issues for Latinas

If you are interested in the scholarship on Latinas and do a computer search of *PsychInfo* or *Psychological Abstracts* looking for any mention of Latinas, Hispanics, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Chicanas, Cubans, Dominicans and any other terms that you can imagine may be used to describe Latinas, you will find a large number of references. As you read through the abstracts you will discard many references because the information about the Latinas is limited to saying that they are not included in the discussion because of lack of access to them or the small numbers responding—pick your reason. For example, from January 1990 to October 1993, there are 4,635 abstracts in *PsychInfo* that include the above words *and* education. When you move away from the global terms such as Latinos or Hispanics and look at specific groups, the numbers become small (education and Mexican American women, 399), and smaller (education and Puerto Ricans, 39), and even smaller (education and Cubans, 3) and (education and Dominicans, 0).

As you start reading the remaining abstracts, you will find two interesting phenomena: (1) many of these references are to dissertations that never got published, and

(2) most of these articles are not in the American Psychological Association's (APA) journals.

In preparation for writing a review article on psychological issues for Latinas (Ginorio, Gutiérrez, Cauce, & Acosta, 1995), my colleagues and I at the University of Washington searched *Psychological Abstracts* for all articles published in 1989 and 1990. We found 105 articles useful for our topics. Of these articles, thirty-nine of the references are found in reports, in-house publications, dissertation abstracts or other hard to access sources. Only three (3) are found in APA journals. The remaining articles are found in ethnic minority journals (30), books or book chapters (17), and feminist journals (16). Padilla and Lindholm (1992) reported a similar distribution doing a search on developmental issues for Mexican-American children.

What did these articles tell us about Latinas? Let me focus on one of the sections for which I was responsible: education of Latinas. The articles that we considered useful told us about the many different aspects that must be considered in understanding the educational experiences of Latinas given their immigration experience, generation, their language fluency, their sex-role identity, their class origins, and even their interests in exogamy. The picture that resulted was complex, contextualized, and incomplete.

However, education was an easy section to write compared to that written by my colleague Mimi Acosta. In writing about mental health issues and therapy, she found more articles addressing weaknesses than strengths of Latinas, focusing on problems that were not as problematic for the Latinas as they were for the Anglo-American therapists, and stereotyping us as passive and nonresponsive to available services. My colleague Lorraine Gutiérrez could not find in those two years a single article dealing with the

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

sexuality of Latinas unless it was in the context of adolescent pregnancy or birth control. Ana Mari Cauce found articles that described the Latino family in such traditional terms that we thought they were talking about our grandparents living in Cuba, Mexico, or Puerto Rico, rather than ourselves living in the United States in the 1990s.

Very few of these articles focused on more than one population. Most of those which offered any comparisons did so with Caucasian Americans. Some of those that ventured into comparative work did so from the ethnocentric position of the culture of origin of the measures (invariably middle-class, Caucasian American) and the authors.

The prospective textbook writer will run into the same barriers to finding the research that we did. They are not likely to be aware of the annotated bibliographies prepared by the Committee on Women in Psychology—the one for Latinas was prepared by Amaro, Russo, & Pares-Avila (1987). Nor are they likely to know that the Committee on Women in Psychology published in 1993 a collection of syllabi, reading lists, and other resources for curriculum development that includes excellent resources for anyone interested in teaching a course on the psychology of all women in the United States. Most textbook writers will not take the trouble to look any further than the three articles that appeared in APA approved journals—after all, their own credibility as authors resides on those very sources. They will end up writing another run-of-the-mill or even well-received introductory textbook in which people of color may be seen, but are not heard. These textbooks are characterized by a high proportion of photos including people of color, maybe even sidebars with contemporary comments, and little in the way of substantive integration of the scholarship that exists. In the words of Bohan (1992, 41), "the historical rendering of women's place has been shaped by the context within which history

has been written . . . it is not surprising to find women largely absent from psychology's histories as well as from contemporary portrayals of the discipline." Ditto for people of color, although they are not the focus of any of the articles of this otherwise fine book. In other words, when it comes to people of color in textbooks, what you see is not what you get, or "Now you see us, now you don't."

Nevertheless, I promised a third story. This story is tied to the first two, although it precedes both. It is entitled "With a little help from my friends/mentors."

Publication Experiences of Latina Psychologists

In 1986, the Committee of Hispanic Women of APA Division 35 decided to do a survey of the Publication Experiences of Latina Psychologists (Ginorio & Cauce, 1988). We were puzzled by the fate of the many dissertations written every year by Latina graduate students, many of them focusing on issues of ethnicity. The survey was distributed among all Latinas listed in the *Directory of Ethnic Minority Human Resources in Psychology* and among those attending the annual APA convention. Of 176 surveys distributed, only thirty were returned; twenty-eight were completed and included in the report.

The twenty-eight Latinas had a mean age of 41 years, ranging from 29 to 56 years of age. Thirteen were Mexican-Americans, eight were Puerto Ricans, four were Cubans, and one was Dominican. Eighteen were married, seven separated/divorced, and three were single; eleven had no children. Twenty-three had a Ph.D. Those surveyed received their highest degree between 1972 and 1987.

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

What did these twenty-eight women tell us? Only ten of the twenty-eight had published anything in the past two years, so even among these respondents publication experiences were limited. They told us that the biggest incentive for publication was the satisfaction of increasing the information base about women and ethnics. The incentive provided by the possibility of increased chances for promotion or tenure or salary increases was not as motivating to this group. They told us that the thing that discouraged them the most from publication was the time needed to publish. They told us that they published mostly in non-APA journals.

Was there something that characterized those Latinas who published from those who did not? Only one question seemed to distinguish the two groups: When asked who or what had encouraged them to publish, those Latinas who published were more likely than those who did not to say that they had been encouraged during graduate school by a mentor *and* to have published an article with their advisor during graduate school years. Perhaps tied to the lack of time mentioned above, the women who did not publish were more likely to have children, although that was not mentioned as a reason for not publishing.

The moral of this survey clearly was that the road to publication begins in graduate school. A mentor can make a whole world of difference in this area. In this way, bringing these stories full circle, they provide the information needed to make our discipline a psychology of all people.

Bibliography

Bond, L. A. 1988. Teaching developmental psychology. In *Teaching a psychology of people: Resources for gender and sociocultural awareness*, edited by P. A. Bronstein & K. Quina. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Bohan, J. S. 1992. Prologue: Re-viewing psychology, re-placing women—an end searching for a means. In *Seldom seen, rarely heard: Women's place in psychology*, edited by J. S. Bohan. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Brown, A., Goodwin, B. J., Hall, B. A., & Jackson-Lowman, H. 1985. A review of psychology of women textbooks: Focus on the Afro-American woman. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 9(1): 29–38.

Committee on Women in Psychology. 1993. *Changing herstory: Integrating diversity into the teaching of psychology*. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.

Ginorio, A. B. & Cauce, A. M. 1988. Publication experiences of Latinas in psychology. American Psychological Association annual conference, Atlanta.

Ginorio, A. B., Butler, J. W., Schmitz, B., & Conte, C. 1991. *Incorporating American ethnic minority women into the curriculum: An evaluation of curriculum change projects, January 1989-December 1992.*

Ginorio, A. B., Gutiérrez, L., Cauce, A. M. & Acosta, M. (1995) Psychological issues for Latina women. In H. Landrine, ed. *Bringing cultural diversity to feminist psychology*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychology Association Press.

Padilla, A. M. & Lindholm, K. J. 1992. What do we know about culturally diverse children? Paper presented at the invited symposium: Racism in Developmental Research, APA Annual Convention. Washington, D.C.

The Impact of the New Scholarship on Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Social Class, and Sexual Orientation on Psychology

Nancy Romer

With fits and starts, with uneven degrees of change within the broad field of psychology, I firmly believe that we, the feminists and multiculturalists, are making headway. I do not delude myself into thinking that we have transformed the field: we have not. Yet within some subfields and in some recent texts, a clear shift is taking place.

Peggy McIntosh of the Wellesley Center for Research on Women offers a five-phase paradigm of curriculum analysis and revision that I believe can help us understand where the field is situated vis-à-vis gender, race, ethnicity, class and sexual orientation (GRECSO). Phase 1 is typified by a total absence of interest in and inclusion of material on GRECSO; the subfields of physiology, neuropsychology, comparative, learning, and perception, fall into this phase. These more "scientifically" and laboratory-based, that is, "masculine," areas are untouched by the new scholarship on GRECSO. Much work by thinkers such as Ruth Bleier (1984), Ruth Hubbard (1982) and Evelyn Fox Keller (1982) attests to the resistance of "scientists" to critically examining their practices and perspectives and to their isolation of women both within and outside the domain.

The subfields of cognition and personality are in Phase 2, in which exceptional researchers are present who raise questions of exceptional interest, but do not influence

or question the field. Of course, the work of Julia Sherman (1978) in cognition and the work of Nancy Chodorow (1978), Karen Horney (1973), and Anna Freud (1958) in personality has had its attention and impact. Yet outside feminist circles, these psychologists have not significantly influenced the area of study or the presentation in the undergraduate texts. They still are perceived and presented as add-ons. According to presentations in abnormal psychology texts and my beleaguered ex-students slogging it out in clinical psychology graduate school, the presence of research or theory informed by GRECSO is pitifully thin and devalued. The subfield of tests and measurements, responding to the "market" in testing, has attempted to improve its ability to minimize cultural influences on at least standardization samples. Efforts to test bilingual individuals in their native languages have become common. But the basic tenets of the subfield are untouched.

A similar dynamic exists within undergraduate courses on research methods or experimental psychology. The feminist criticism so well presented in most psychology of women texts is less prominent in experimental psychology courses. Inclusion of diverse populations, representative samples, and comparison groups in research, with attention to the sex (and perhaps race) of the experimenter and subject is usually the sum of discussion of bias in research. Generally, insufficient attention is paid to theoretical bias, developing hypotheses, defining variables such as "normal," interpreting results and publication practices. These are core issues a multicultural and feminist analysis would have us attend to (Crawley and Ecker, 1990; Cannon, Higginbotham & Leung, 1988; Grady, 1981).

The more socially defined areas such as social psychology, developmental psychology, and psychology of women have experienced a significant shift. I would place social psychology into Phase 3: research on GRECSO is

present and seen as problematic, indicating bias in the field. There is significant inclusion in social psychology of work on topics such as group differences, prejudice and discrimination. Yet it does not seem to have raised sufficient questions so as to alter the overall analysis present in the field. I might also add that while social psychology does see gender, race and, to some extent, ethnicity as important variables for study, it leaves out social class almost totally and only fleetingly refers to sexual orientation. Developmental psychology and, even more so, psychology of women have experienced the most change. They may be in Phase 4, in which there is acknowledgment of the variety and centrality of historical and cultural context present in the content and practice of the field. Here, again, gender, race, and more weakly, ethnicity, are the subjects of research and presented in growing detail. Social class and sexual orientation figure to a lesser degree but still shade the overall analysis. These two subfields are definitely beginning to call for Phase 5: a paradigm shift and a redefinition and reconstruction of the field to incorporate inclusivity in theory, research and practice. Individuals in each of these subfields have transformed their work; textbook writers in some subfields are beginning to present the field as one in transition.

A wonderful new introductory psychology text, *The World of Psychology*, by Ellen R. Green Wood and Samuel E. Wood, published in 1993, reviews the field with an eye toward GRECSO. The authors attempt to include "multiculturalism" as much as each subfield allows; indeed their rendition shows the range of influence of GRECSO from totally absent in some subfields to raising central questions in others. But still, the presentation is Milquetoast and certainly not confrontational toward mainstream psychology. Rhoda Unger and Mary Crawford present a well-thought-out review of GRECSO in their excellent *Women and Gender: a Feminist Psychology*. This 1993 text takes all

the elements of GRECSO into close account and attempts to integrate the material into the body of the text, as opposed to only adding separate sections dealing with GRECSO. While the separated section approach is still the primary mode of presentation, more is integrated into the whole than in any other text I have seen in this subfield. Another fine text, *The Development of Children*, by Michael and Sheila Cole, offers the most dynamic version of Phase 4 thinking that I have seen in a text. They present a sociocultural-context theoretical approach to most of the problems and areas of study presented. They are on the verge of calling for a Phase 5 paradigm shift in the field at large.

It is important to note that texts published even two years ago do not present as much in this domain. Each year seems to count profoundly in locating the field in terms of GRECSO. The multicultural movement has not wrested a paradigm shift, but we have forced our way into the play, and sometimes we get center stage. While the standard bearers of academe kept kicking and screaming about the dilution of academic standards and the disintegration of a shared American, that is, Euroamerican male, perspective (Schlessinger 1992), I believe the feminist and multicultural critique have shown our intellectual muscle. Moreover, we did our organizational homework. We did research, we wrote books and articles, had endless conferences, lobbied for and created faculty development seminars, created study groups, organized student groups, and presented our own curricula and syllabi as examples. All this work is beginning to pay off.

I would like to shift our focus to what actually goes on in an undergraduate psychology classroom. Despite available technologies and a great deal of material available on varied styles of learning and feminist/empowering pedagogy, (e.g., Frieré, 1970; Belenky et al., 1986; Shrews-

bury, 1987), little has trickled down. Most undergraduates are fed a steady diet of lectures, with perhaps a slide show or video thrown in for variation. Little discussion or small group work occurs. Opinion is rarely asked for or developed; multiple choice tests are the standard fare of evaluation. Most striking are the problems undergraduates face with math anxiety as they turn their attention toward statistics. As a group, women of all backgrounds and men of color are more likely to be intimidated and struggle (sometimes aimlessly) with statistical methods in psychology. We know how to decrease anxiety and make education—especially mathematics and science education—accessible for all. Overall, the presence of more debate and discussion, a portfolio approach to evaluation with a variety of measures, frequent feedback and individual mentoring, direct experience, "hands-on" opportunities, and an insistence on writing both for tests and research or term papers would improve the field of study for most students. Yet massive classes, tired faculty, and poor past practices continue to repeat their deleterious influences. By default we buy into a "survival of the fittest" (most often assumed to be more privileged white middle-class males) approach to teaching and learning.

Many of these problems are being addressed by present graduate students who are seeking the paradigm shift that Phase 5 revisioning demands. They are beginning to write exciting, culturally contextual dissertations. They are finding new materials for classroom use and new ways of presenting this challenging material. But full-time faculty positions in the field of psychology are rare. That generally leaves an aging, tired, and too often passive faculty too little influenced by the most radical tendencies of the field. In my own department at Brooklyn College, out of twenty-four full-time faculty members (down from sixty in 1975) only four are women, one man is black, another man is

Asian. Moreover, while I have been at this job for twenty years, I am still the third youngest, the fourth from the bottom of the seniority list, and the last appointment occurred eight years ago. I do not mean to put undue pressure or unrealistic hopes on the next generation of psychology professors, but I do feel they will be midwives to a transition of the field. Right now too many undergraduate psychology courses are taught by graduate student adjuncts who are wildly exploited and are really less able to have an impact on the field than we desperately need them to have. If we full-time faculty members begin to demand that more full-time faculty be hired to teach, graduate student employment problems and transformation of the field will be facilitated.

Finally, I want to address the needs of undergraduates, those most dear to my academic heart and experience. Frequently we are attracting women, people of color, and progressive white men. They want to know how the field can answer questions in their own lives. They also want to know how the field can answer questions for the groups they live in and come from and wish to continue to connect to. They are, as a group, tremendously open to a complex understanding of GRECSO. They are open to the struggle of pulling the theoretical pieces together, as Patricia Hill Collins (1990) suggests, to eventually birth a new perspective, still in its gestation. I have hope for this next generation of psychologists who are being raised, so to speak, with a feminist and multicultural possibility and awareness, though the field itself is sorely lacking. What will they choose to study? What theoretical analyses will they create? What ideas will guide their practical applications of psychology? I do not know these answers. But I do know that the field is in transition and that the opening of our Pandora's box will leave the field changed forever.

Bibliography

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R. & Tarule, J. M. 1986. *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Bleier, R. 1984. *Science and gender: A critique of biology and its theories on women.* New York: Pergamon.

Cannon, L., Higginbotham, E. and Leung, M. L. A. 1988. Race and class bias in qualitative research on women. *Gender and Society,* 2:449-62.

Chodorow, N. 1978. *The reproduction of mothering: Psychoanalysis and the sociology of gender.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cole, M. and Cole, S. 1993. *The development of children.* New York: Scientific American.

Collins, P. H. 1990. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* New York: Routledge.

Crawley, D. and Ecker, M. 1990. Integrating issues of gender, race, and ethnicity into experimental psychology and other social science methodology courses. In *The New Jersey project: Integrating the scholarship on gender 1986-1989,* edited by C. H. Smith and F. Olin. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Eccles, J. S. and Jacobs, J. E. 1986. Social forces shape math attitudes and performance. *Signs* 11(21): 367-89.

Freud, A. 1958. Adolescence. In *The psychoanalytic study of the child.* Vol. 8. New York.:International Universities Press.

Freiré, P. 1970. *The pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Herder & Herder.

Grady, K. E. 1981. Sex bias in research design. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 5:628-36.

Horney, K. 1973. *Feminine psychology.* New York: Norton.

Hubbard, R., Henifin, M. S., & Fried, B. eds. 1982. *Biological woman: the convenient myth.* Cambridge, Mass.: Schenckman.

Keller, E. F. 1982. Feminism and science. *Signs* 7:587-602.

McIntosh, P. 1984. Interactive phases of curriculum re-vision: A feminist perspective. Working Paper #124, Wellesley Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, Mass.

Schlessinger, A. 1992. *The disuniting of America.* New York: Norton.

Schrewsbury, C. 1987. What is feminist pedagogy? *Women's Studies Quarterly* 15:3-4, 6-14.

Sherman, J. 1978. *Sex-related cognitive differences.* Springfield, Ill.: Thomas.

Unger, R. & Crawford, M. 1993. *Women and gender: A feminist psychology.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wood, E. R. G. and Wood, S. E. 1993. *The world of psychology.* Boston, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon.

A Just Noticeable Difference: The Impact of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Social Class on Psychology

Rhoda K. Unger

The question that we have been asked to address today is whether and how research on gender, race, ethnicity, and social class has influenced the discipline of psychology. The answer to this question is complicated, however, by another question. Which part of the discipline of psychology should we address? Psychology is one of the most fragmented disciplines in academia as is exemplified by the recent split of its professional organization into one group (the American Psychological Association) that stresses the interests of clinicians and practitioners and another group (the American Psychological Society) that professes to speak for experimentalists and/or academicians. This fragmentation is further exemplified by the almost fifty professional sub-groupings or divisions found within senior organization—APA.

The rifts within psychology reflect differences in paradigms—in terms of both methodology and the epistemological assumptions that underlie which methodology is preferred (Unger, 1983; 1989). Psychologists can usually be classified as people who are interested in the individual and his or her personal adjustment or as those who are interested in finding the general laws that underlie behavior. Neither group has, however, been interested in gender, race, ethnicity, or social class.

An Analysis of Introductory Psychology Textbooks

In recent years there have been several attempts to document the extent of the omissions in textbooks. Some feminist scholars (Riger 1992; Shields, 1994) have looked at the impact of feminist scholarship on the field as a whole, whereas others (Fine 1986; Lykes & Stewart 1986) have attempted to document changes in feminist scholarship. In my analysis I will focus on how less powerful individuals (women, people of color, the poor, etc.) and social categories such as gender, race, and class are dealt with by introductory texts in psychology. I will do so because introductory texts have been relatively unaffected by the schisms in psychology and represent a disciplinary consensus on what beginning students need to know about the field.

I am not the first nor the only feminist to look at introductory texts as a marker for psychologists' views of their discipline. Peterson and Kroner (1992), for example, conducted an extensive content analysis of current textbooks in introductory psychology and human development. They concluded that although there has been some decrease in sex-stereotyped language and in gender-biased content since 1975, representation of the work, theory and behavior of males continues to significantly exceed the representation of the work, theory, and behavior of females.

Besides documenting the extent to which introductory texts pay less attention to women than to men, Peterson and Kroner (1992) examined some content-related issues in these texts' presentation of gender. They found that females continue to be presented in more passive contexts than are males. In an analysis of the pictorial content of the texts, they also found that females were much more

likely to be used to illustrate various pathologies and to be shown as clients in therapy than males. In other words, females are still being portrayed in negative and gender-biased ways.

A brief examination of introductory texts favored by members of my own department also shows that these texts remain both ethnocentric and androcentric. The "worst" offenders (if it is possible to rank order such high levels of bias) are those texts that purport to present a scientific view of the discipline (Gleitman 1992; Weiten 1994; Zimbardo 1992). An analysis of their subject indexes showed that, as a group, these three had a total of twelve pages with a reference to gender and no pages devoted to race or ethnicity. These findings are particularly disheartening because the Zimbardo text is in its thirteenth edition and, during my term on the board that constructed the Graduate Record Exam in psychology, I learned that Gleitman was the favorite resource of the "experts" who construct this exam.

One of these texts (Weiten) has an additional eight pages devoted to gender differences. This latter finding is consistent with Mary Brabeck's observation (personal communication) that although most current introductory psychology texts cover Maccoby Jacklin's (1974) groundbreaking work on sex differences, they highlight the few differences rather than the many similarities found between the sexes.

Introductory textbooks written by psychologists with a social or developmental perspective may be more aware of recent feminist research. For example, the most recent edition of Myers' text (1992) has twenty-two pages noting gender in its subject and eight pages noting race and/or ethnicity. However, even this text has twenty-two pages where the term "gender difference" appears.

The original edition of Myers in 1986 included a chapter on gender, but this has been changed in the current edition to a chapter on social diversity. I am not sure how to evaluate this change to greater inclusiveness because I am uncomfortable with its rationale. As one reviewer for the earlier version, I know that the change was due, in part, to the unwillingness of many introductory psychology instructors to consider gender a legitimate part of a first course in psychology. I do not know if they are more comfortable with the current theme of cultural and gender diversity.

The most inclusive introductory text currently available is one by Allen and Santrock (1993). It is the only text that I know of written, in part, by an African-American woman. Its subject index notes forty-six pages on gender (and none on gender differences) forty pages on ethnicity, and even eleven pages on social class. It is also the only current text with a chapter on gender (although I am not sure it is a good idea to group gender and sexuality). Photos of women and people of color from a variety of cultures are included throughout the book and the text contains a number of units designed to facilitate critical thinking about sociocultural issues. It also features the work of feminist psychologists and psychologists of color. Obviously, this is a unique text and it will be interesting to see if it is commercially successful enough to spawn imitators.

Other Forms of Omission in the Discipline

Although the evidence shows that both gender and ethnicity are largely ignored by the discipline as a whole, psychology has done even less to acknowledge what happens when these two variables are combined (Landrine,

Klonoff, & Brown-Collins, 1992; Unger & Saundra, 1993). To paraphrase the title of a book on black women's studies (Hull, Scott, & Smith, 1982), all the blacks are men and all the women are white in most empirical studies. The lack of studies that look at gender, ethnicity, and class simultaneously often leads to confusion in which one of these factors is seen as the primary causal agent. Since psychology remains committed to generalizable "scientific" explanations, such causal factors are frequently seen as biological in nature while sociocultural causality is ignored (Unger, 1993).

Additional problems arise due to biases in the kind of methodology chosen. When women of color are studied by psychologists, they are more likely to be found as case histories or anecdotal data than in experimental designs (Unger & Saundra, 1993). The lack of comparability between studies of white men and nonwhite "others" obviously limits the conclusions that can be drawn in any review. Moreover, because of the differences between the methodologies used, the inclusion of women of color as "exceptions" to dominant paradigms may be perceived as tokenism. Thus, the data may be ignored rather than used to provide an effective challenge to such paradigms.

The omission of social class has been so complete that few psychologists have even noted its absence from the discipline. It has been suggested that some mainstream experimental psychologists are disturbed by our attention to specific studied populations because they subvert the attempt to find general principles and laws underlying behavior (Reid, 1993). However, even feminist scholarship within psychology is impoverished by a lack of studies concerned with either social class or ethnicity (Fine, 1992). As Pam Reid has pointed out, this kind of exclusion can lead us "to equate the socialization of a twenty-year-old White middle-class Jewish woman with that of a thirty-five-year-

old middle-class African-American Southern Baptist woman or that of a sixteen-year-old Latina who is middle class and Catholic" (1993, p. 138).

Feminist Scholarship and the Study of Race, Ethnicity, and Class

Until recently, women of color were still largely excluded from textbooks on the psychology of women (Brown, Goodwin, Hall, & Jackson-Lowman, 1985). Within these texts, studies of women of color were more likely to focus on their childbearing experience, often to the exclusion of other life events. For example, in many studies of teenage and single mothers, where women are treated as aberrant and needy, minority women are often considered to be the appropriate norm group (Reid, 1993).

Perhaps defensively, I would argue that the exclusion of aspects of race, ethnicity, and class from psychology of women textbooks is not entirely a matter of choice. Textbook authors must rely mainly on resources that have some legitimacy within psychology as a whole. Thus, the omission of race, class, and ethnicity from psychological journals functions interactively to reinforce preexisting biases.

It is hard to evade this kind of double bind. For example, I recently co-authored a text on women and gender (Unger & Crawford, 1992) in which we tried to be as inclusive as possible. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this paper, I examined its subject index for entries cross-listed for African-American women and Latinas and found the following distribution of pages for African-American women: clinical (8), developmental (6), sexuality (13), social (9), and work (4). As many pages (6) were devoted to

a discussion of clinical and sexual issues among Latinas as were noted for work and developmental aspects of their lives. There was not enough information in the book on Asian- or Native-American women to provide this kind of breakdown. This distribution reflects where in psychology studies of women of color can be found (when they can be found at all).

The fact that more studies of minority women can be found in clinical than in social psychological journals has implications for both the target population and for feminist psychology as a whole. Obviously, an emphasis on clinical issues and so-called "deviant" forms of sexuality reinforces the idea that minority women require psychological assistance. What is notably absent from mainstream clinical views of minority women is consideration of the social context in which they live their lives. To redress this omission in our discussion of clinical issues, we also discussed alternative coping skills (cf. Fine, 1983); the role of poverty in depression (cf., McGrath, Keita, Strickland, & Russo, 1990); and the adaptive nature of variations in the timing of family and work roles (cf. Hamburg, 1986).

An additional strategy we employed was to use omissions in the research on minority women for feminist pedagogical purposes. For example, although we combed the professional literature, we were only able to find three studies on eating disorders in women. We discussed this omission in terms of two alternative possibilities. (1) Psychologists do not expect to find eating disorders in women of color and, therefore, do not look for them or diagnose them when they are present. (2) Women of color do, indeed, have fewer eating disorders than white women. This latter hypothesis allowed us to discuss the social context of anorexia and other eating disorders and to show the paradoxical benefits to women of color of a primarily white standard of beauty. 32

The Social Context and Bias in Psychology

Stephanie Riger (1992) has suggested recently that psychology is particularly resistant to consideration of gender, race, and class because it resists acknowledgment of the social context. A minor point in support of her argument is provided by the fact that in all of the recent introductory psychology textbooks I examined (including the most inclusive one), the chapter on social psychology was the last chapter of the text. If the instructor runs out of time, this chapter would be the most likely one to be omitted.

Social psychologists, including myself, are also the most likely professionals to feel unrepresented in the recent division of special interests within organized psychology. I even remember a job interview some years ago where my identity as a social psychologist was considered subversive although I had expected my identity as a feminist would be the problematic issue. The problematic epistemological location of social psychology within psychological theory and practice does not bode well for a greater place for social issues within the mainstream discipline.

Nevertheless, the inclusion of social and cultural factors makes for better science and better theory. I have argued recently (Unger & Sanchez-Hucles, 1993) that the inclusion of sociocultural levels of analysis allows feminist psychologists to transcend the terms of the essentialist/constructionist debate about women and gender. The meaning of gender in different cultures is altered by factors such as social roles, relative status, and societal norms which determine which behaviors will be considered socially acceptable or deviant.

In a similar vein, Hope Landrine and her associates (Landrine, Klonoff, & Brown-Collins, 1992) have argued that feminist psychologists must use both *etic* (standardized, objective, controlled) and *emic* (subjective, qualitative) strategies to understand culturally diverse populations. They have shown that similarly labeled behaviors have a different meaning for white women and women of color.

We should recognize, however, that these different methodologies have differential value within psychology. Methods that attempt to analyze subjectivity may be ideologically suspect because they are associated with feminist and other socially activist agendas. Such methods, of course, also do not fit in with psychology's attempt to find generalizable laws of behavior.

More than ten years ago (Unger, 1982), I noted that feminism as a theoretical framework would have more difficulty being integrated into psychology than would women as either practitioners or subjects of research. Unfortunately, this prediction seems to have been correct. Stephanie Shields (1994) notes that over the past twenty-five years contemporary feminist psychologists have developed an impressive variety and range of empirical work and theory. She offers a long list of texts and methodological and theoretical critiques to support her argument as well as an inventory of previously unexamined questions with important social implications that have been addressed. The latter list includes a large range of topics such as sex bias in language, women's adult development, and date rape.

Nevertheless, she also points out that the insights of feminist psychology have remained invisible to psychology as a whole. Feminist scholarship is largely omitted from psychology textbooks at any level. Most mainstream psychologists are unaware of any feminist perspective and, at

best, embody it only in the personae of the few feminist psychologists who can be found in a given department. Such perspectives remain, of course, "ghettoized" within courses on the psychology of women and gender—taught at approximately 50 percent of all institutions of higher education. In my most pessimistic moments, I predict that multicultural perspectives that seek to integrate issues of ethnicity and class into psychology will suffer the same neglect.

Some Constructive Suggestions

What can we do about this problem? We can write our own textbooks, as Allen and Santrock have done. We can publicize and use the work of our feminist and multicultural colleagues, as I attempted to do in this essay. One promising development is the large amount of work on neglected topics and populations that has been appearing recently. One such example is a recent article by Jan Yoder and Arnie Kahn in the *American Psychologist* (1993) on methods for creating a more inclusive psychology of women.

Janis Sanchez-Hucles and I co-edited a special issue of the *Psychology of Women Quarterly* (1993) on gender and culture that is due out in December 1993. This issue aims to use culture to interrogate gender. Hope Landrine (1995) has edited a handbook of cultural diversity in feminist psychology. The book provides an enormous resource of studies on many populations that have been usually invisible. A book edited by Carol Franz and Abigail Stewart (1994), entitled *Women Creating Lives*, is a rich collection of case studies that show the extent to which poor and ethnically diverse women improvise, construct, and lay claim to their lives.

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

Finally, we can continue to develop curricular materials in this area. The advantage here is that we do not have to remain bound by traditional disciplinary constraints. Our example will teach our students that they, too, do not need to feel bound. A paradigm shift will take place when a new generation without years of commitment to the existent ideology comes to power. It may be that such a shift is already taking place and psychology—one of the more conservative disciplines—has simply not yet noticed.

References

Allen, L. & Santrock, J. W. 1993. *Psychology: The contexts of behavior.* Dubuque, Iowa: Brown & Benchmark.

Brow, A., Goodwin, B. J., Hall, B. A., & Jackson-Lowman, H. 1985. A review of psychology of women textbooks: Focus on the Afro-American woman. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 9, 13 9–38.

Fine, M. 1983. Coping with rape: Critical perspectives on consciousness. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality* 3:49–267.

Fine, M. 1985. Reflections on a feminist psychology of women: Paradoxes and prospects. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 9:167–83.

Fine, M. 1992. Review of women and gender: A feminist psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 16:365–67.

Franz, C. E. & Stewart, A. S., eds. 1994. *Women creating lives: Identities, resilience, and resistance.* Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.

Gleitman, H. 1992. *Psychology.* New York: Norton.

Hamburg, B. A. 1986. Subsets of adolescent mothers: Developmental, biomedical, and psychosocial issues. In *School age pregnancy and parenthood,* edited by B. A. Hamburg & J. B. Lancaster. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Hull, A., Scott, P., & Smith, B. 1982. *All the women are white, all the blacks are men, but some of us are brave: Black women's studies.* Westbury, N.Y.: Feminist Press.

Landrine, H. ed. 1995. *Bringing cultural diversity to feminist psychology: Theory, research, and practice*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Landrine, H., Klonoff, E. A., & Brown-Collins, A. 1992. Cultural diversity and methodology in feminist psychology: Critique, proposal, empirical example. *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* 16:145–63.

Lykes, M. B. & Stewart, A. S. 1986. Evaluating the feminist challenge in personality and social psychology: 1963-1983. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 10:293–412.

Maccoby, E. E. & Jacklin, C. N. 1974. *The psychology of sex differences.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

McGrath, E., Keita, G. P., Strickland, B. R., & Russo, N. F. 1990. *Women and depression: Risk factors and treatment issues.* Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Myers, D. G. 1992. *Psychology.* 3rd ed. New York: Worth Publishers.

Peterson, S. B. & Kroner, T. 1992. Gender biases in textbooks for introductory psychology and human development. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 16:17–36.

Reid, P. T. 1993. Poor women in psychological research: Shut up and shut out. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 17:133–50.

Riger, S. 1992. Epistemological debates, feminist voices, science, social values, and the study of women. *American Psychologist* 47:730–40.

Shields, S. A. 1994. Blindsight: Overcoming mainstream psychology's resistance to feminist theory and research. *Psychological Inquiry* 5:92–96.

Unger, R. K. 1982. Advocacy versus scholarship revisited: Issues in the psychology of women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 7:5–17.

Unger, R. K. 1983. Through the looking glass: No wonderland yet! (The reciprocal relationship between methodology and models of reality). *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 8:9–32

Unger, R. K. 1989. Sex, gender, and epistemology. In *Gender and thought,* edited by M. Crawford & M. Gentry. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Unger, R. K. 1993. Alternative conceptions of sex (and sex differences). In M. Haug, et al., eds. *The development of sex differences and similarities in behavior.* Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 457–76.

Unger, R. K. & Crawford, M. 1992. *Women and gender: A feminist psychology.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Unger, R. K. & Sanchez-Hucles, J. 1993. Integrating gender: Implications for the psychology of women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* 17:365–72.

Unger, R. K. & Sanchez-Hucles, J. eds. 1993. Gender and culture. Special Issue of the *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* 17, No. 4.

Unger, R. K. & Saundra 1993. Sexism: An integrated perspective. In *Psychology of women: A handbook of issues and theories,* edited by F. L. Denmark & M. A. Paludi. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Weiten, W. 1994. *Psychology. Themes and variations,* 2d ed. Pacific Grove, Calif.: Brooks/Cole.

Yoder, J. D. & Kahn, A. S. 1993. Working toward an inclusive psychology of women. *American Psychologist* 48:846–50.

Zimbardo, P. G. 1992. *Psychology and life.* 13th ed. New York: HarperCollins.

Scholarship and the Discipline: The Study of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, Social Class and Sexual Orientation

Karen Fraser Wyche

One main question we have been asked to address in this seminar is how the last twenty years of scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, social class, and sexual orientation has influenced psychology as a discipline. My response is that the discipline has been slow to accept and to integrate this knowledge into the field. What can be said is that among all these aspects and characteristics of human behavior, gender has been given more acceptance. Less attention has been given to incorporating research findings regarding ethnic minority populations, social class, or sexual orientation.

Feminist psychologists have been at the forefront of the movement to incorporate gender into the study of psychological processes. As a result, psychology has had to recognize, although not willingly, that the study of women is a legitimate research topic. However, still undetermined is the willingness of traditionally trained psychologists to incorporate gender into their own work. One result can be a recognition that gender is important as a variable of inquiry, but to move beyond this and to incorporate within one's work a gendered analysis of both women and men is not often done. As a result, there are many psychologists whose accommodation to the question of differences and/or commonalities between women and men rests only on including female and male in the statistical analysis of results. It is those psychologists who apply a feminist analy-

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

sis to theory and research who use the body of knowledge generated regarding women and men in their research agendas.

Psychology as a discipline has given less attention to social class issues. We do not have a good understanding of how class influences behavior. We know a great deal about middle-class white America (Graham, 1992), for it is this group that has been the primary focus of psychological inquiry. Generalizations from white, middle-class and predominantly male populations are applied to all people. These generalizations make the assumption that principles of behavior are universal and do not vary across age, class, gender, and so forth. Class has been partially examined in the study of the poor, who are disproportionately ethnic minority people. But race, ethnicity, and class can be confounded in the United States, and researchers have often ignored this fact. Even less is known about poor Euro-american people. The research that exists on low-income populations has not focused on the interactions of gender and social class or on comparative work across class.

Much less attention has been given to incorporating knowledge about ethnicity and race in the study of human behavior in mainstream psychology. What exists are studies of particular groups of ethnic and racial populations which, with few exceptions, ignore the interaction of gender and race. Research with ethnic minority participants has focused primarily on psychopathology and/or stereotypes of behavior with captive audiences such as clinic or school populations (Wyche, 1993). There is less interest in normal developmental processes. For example, African-Americans are studied for teenage motherhood, Asian-Americans for academic achievement as the "model minority," American Indians for suicide and alcoholism, Latino-Americans for acculturated stress. These examples of stereotyping and problematic behavior represent a large body

of research for these populations. As a result, students studying psychology can make the following assumptions: that alcoholism is an American Indian disease; that all Asian-Americans are high achievers (and if one is not, then there is something terribly wrong); and that African-American teenage young women will become mothers soon, if they aren't already. The point is not that these situations don't exist but, instead, that these are the ways in which minority populations have been studied.

In contrast to research on ethnic and racial minorities in the United States is the area of cross-cultural psychology. Cross-cultural psychology has focused on non-United States populations and has been regarded as a respectable area of research. The opposite is true regarding research on minority populations in the United States. This has been considered marginal, a low-priority research area.

Research on sexuality has focused on psychopathology. Researchers have studied sexually deviant behavior, sexual identity confusion, and so forth. When gender or race is examined, therefore, it is in populations with specific problems. For example, the current research on AIDS-infected women cannot ignore gender, but does ignore class. For HIV-positive men, the research is primarily on gay middle-class men. Less is known about minority men.

Now, I wish to focus on the interrelationships between research findings, journal publications, and curriculum. Whether a curriculum has been redefined by the changes in the discipline cannot be answered without addressing these interrelationships. As argued previously, the attempts to reconceptualize psychology have been minor. To illustrate this I would like to use as an example the research theories regarding models of cultural adaptation. Oetting and Beauvias (1990–91) have discussed the historical transition

from research models that have as an assumption that healthy adaptation occurs when an individual accepts the dominant culture. Several models exemplify this framework. The first, the Dominant Model, poses that movement away from ethnic culture to the dominant culture is positive and no movement is negative. This model is followed by the Transitional Model that describes movement from the minority culture as neither good nor bad, but, assumes that a person will move to a majority/dominant culture. While doing this, it is expected that the person will experience acculturative stress. The Alienation Model hypothesizes that a person's movement from the minority culture to the dominant culture would be characterized by alienation from both cultures in this process. Models that do not assume that movement to the dominant culture as always occurring are more reflective of current research paradigms. The Multidimensional Model places the individual somewhere between the two cultures. There is an assumption that a person can have multiple dimensions, such as ethnic loyalty, while other cultural patterns such as language can change. Perhaps the most popular model is the Bicultural Model, by which individuals are understood as able to move comfortably back and forth between their own culture and the dominant culture with high levels of involvement in both. Although these latter models are an improvement over the former ones, they are limited by the lack of attention to gender and class variables.

If we go to the next level of understanding of how a discipline influences a curriculum and the teaching of the subject matter we must examine what and how knowledge is published in journals. For psychologists, publication in journals is the most prestigious way to be recognized and to publicize one's scholarship. The growth of research relating to gender far exceeds that of ethnicity and class, yet most of the publications in psychological journals are in

none of these areas. The growth of research relating to women's issues depends on the productivity of feminist psychologists. Unfortunately, little of this scholarship is represented in journals published by the American Psychological Association. These are the journals that academics view as most prestigious because of their peer review process and high rejection rates. The same holds true for ethnic minority research topics, which are considered less prestigious and more marginal compared to psychology of women studies. Much of this research exists in specialty journals, simply because the most competitive and/or APA journals do not publish this research. The decisions about what to publish are influenced by the composition of editorial boards. The American Psychological Association has reported the small number of women and ethnic minority individuals, compared to white men, on these boards. In her study of six American Psychological Association journals that publish research on human behavior, Sandra Graham (1992) reports that for African-Americans the number of articles decreased over the last decade for all the journals surveyed. She also describes that the race of experimenter and the social class standing of subjects is missing in most of the articles published. Sue Rosenberg Zalk (1991) surveyed fourteen major psychology journals for the Division on Psychology of Women's Newsletter (Division 35) and found that the gender of research participants was not mentioned in 40 percent of the studies and 65 percent did not mention the race or ethnicity of the participants. Journals such as *Psychology of Women Quarterly* and *Sex Roles* ask authors to report the gender and ethnicity of research participants. Yet even here social class is not routinely reported.

What is available for teachers of undergraduate curriculum often relates to what is available to them in textbooks. My colleagues have spoken quite eloquently re-

garding the shortcomings of these textbooks, so there is no need to repeat this sad tale. My only point is that writers of textbooks look to the research literature in creating their text. When the literature ignores gender, race, ethnicity, class, and sexual orientation, then this work will not be available to the writers of these texts. Reports regarding the curriculum in psychology, therefore, also show this deficit (McGovern et al., 1991). In reviewing how the discipline of psychology fits within a liberal arts framework, the focus has been more on which speciality areas of psychology to include, not how to reflect a world that is gendered, ethnic, and stratified by class. Even the computer electronic bulletin board on the teaching of psychology focuses on tips for test giving, textbook selection, or other topics for teaching, not on how to integrate these ideas about gender, race, ethnicity, class, and sexual orientation into the curriculum.

Related to these issues is the production of psychologists with a Ph.D. The small number of minority women and men who received a Ph.D. in psychology within the last decade is a deplorable fact (Wyche and Graves, 1992). Those who received degrees are primarily in four areas: clinical, counseling, social, and developmental. Students who wish to study gender and minority populations still receive warnings, as I did a decade ago, of the marginalization of these areas within mainstream psychology and encouragement to do the "ethnic" or "gender thing" after getting tenure. This gives a clear message to junior faculty members that their research careers should be geared to maintaining the status quo.

It appears, in my discussion with other colleagues, that those of us who are not in psychology departments, but departments that are multidisciplinary, have more opportunity to pursue research relating to these issues and to teach courses that use this literature. In my institution,

white students predominate in these courses, much to the surprise of many who feel topics of gender, race, class, ethnicity, and sexual orientation are ghettoized courses.

All these issues relate to the discipline of psychology. The discipline limits its own horizons in not focusing on what the world is like today. To ignore the gendered, multicultural, and class-stratified world in which we live is problematic to a discipline that purports to study human behavior.

Bibliography

Graham, S. 1992. Most of the subjects were white and middle-class. Trends in published research on African-Americans in selected APA journals, 1970–90. *American Psychologist* 47:629–39.

Oetting, E. K., & Beauvias, F. 1990–91. Orthogonal cultural identification theory. The cultural identification of minority adolescents. *The International Journal of the Addictions* 25:655–85.

McGovern, T. V., Furumoto, L., Halpern, D. F., Kimble, G. A. & McKeachie, W. J. 1991. Liberal education, study in depth, and the arts and sciences major-psychology. *American Psychologist* 46:598–605.

Wyche, K. F. 1993. Psychology and African-American women: Findings from applied research. *Applied and Preventive Psychology* 2:115–21.

Wyche, K. F., & Graves, S. B. 1992. Minority women in academia: Access and barriers to professional participation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 16:429–38.

Zalk, S. R. 1991. Task force report response of mainstream journals to feminist submissions. *Psychology of Women: Newsletter* (Fall):10–12.

Contributors

Note: These biographical notes were current as of 1993 when these essays were first published.

ANGELA B. GINORIO is Director of the Northwest Center for Research on Women and an Adjunct Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of Washington. Her B.A. and M.A. were earned at the University of Puerto Rico and her Ph.D. in Social Psychology at Fordham University. She has participated in training workshops on cross-cultural research (East-West Center), human sexuality (Masters and Johnson Institute), and Asian-American research methods (Pacific/Asian-American Mental Health Research Center). She has also taught at Bowling Green State University, Fordham University, Pace University, and the University of Puerto Rico.

Prof. Ginorio had received grants from the National Commission for the Humanities, the Seattle and Washington State Arts Commissions, and foundations, including the Ford Foundation which funded her and Johnnella Butler to do an evaluation of their project, "Incorporating American Ethnic Women into the Curriculum." Her numerous publications include articles in journals such as *Sex Roles, Psychotherapy, Psychology and Sociology of Sport*, and *Public Personnel Management*. She has edited special issues of *SASP (Society for the Advancement of Social Psychology) Newsletter* (1979) and the *Women's Studies Quarterly* (1990). She has published book chapters in, among others, *Ethnic Conflict: International Perspectives* (1987) and

(with others) *Ivory Power: Sexual Harassment on Campus* (1990, 1995), a series of technical reports and publications for, among others, the Bilingual Bicultural Section of the Illinois Office of Education and the Center for the Prevention of Sexual and Domestic Violence in Seattle. She is on the editorial board of the *International Journal of Intercultural Relations and Sex Roles*, has chaired the Committee on Hispanic Women of APA Division 35, and is chair of the Committee on Women of Color for APA Division 45 (Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues).

DOROTHY O. HELLY is Professor of History and Women's Studies at Hunter College and The Graduate School at the City University of New York. She has worked with CUNY curriculum transformation projects since 1983 and has co-facilitated the CUNY Faculty Development Seminar in Balancing the Curriculum for Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class. She created the Seminar on Scholarship and Curriculum at the CUNY Academy of the Humanities and Sciences to provide a general forum for discussing these issues, and is a member of the advisory committee of the National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women, located at Towson State University, Maryland. She is the author of *Livingstone's Legacy: Horace Waller and Victorian Mythmaking* (1987), coauthor of *Women's Realities, Women's Choices: An Introduction to Women's Studies* (1983, 1995), and coeditor of *Gendered Domains: Rethinking Public and Private in Women's History* (1992). She has also written on "Doing History Today," in *Revolutions in Knowledge: Feminism in the Social Sciences* (1992), ed. S. R. Zalk and J. Gordon-Kelter, and (with H. Callaway) "Crusader for Empire: Flora Shaw/Lady Lugard," in *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance* (1992), ed. N. Chaudhuri and M. Strobel.

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

NANCY ROMER is Professor of Psychology at Brooklyn College. Her B.A. was earned at New York University and her M.S., M.A., and Ph.D. at the University of Michigan. She is author of *The Sex-Role Cycle: Socialization from Infancy to Old Age* and numerous articles in such journals as *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, the *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, Sex Roles, Developmental Psychology*, and *Research in Education*. She has published book chapters in such books as *Women Under Attack, Inventory of Marriage and Family Literature, Community-Action, Planning, Development: A Casebook*, and *Tenants and the Urban Housing Crisis*. Her research projects have been funded by many grants from such foundations as the Aaron Diamond Foundation, Morgan Guaranty, and the Hunt Alternatives Fund, and by the Professional Staff Congress awards at the City University of New York.

Prof. Romer is Co-Director at Brooklyn College of the Multicultural Center; the Multicultural Action Committee; Project Impact, a women's advocacy internship program; and has been the Coordinator of the Women's Studies Program. Her most recent project has involved Bilingual Afterschool Programs for high school students in Creole, Spanish, and Russian, using Brooklyn College students as tutors. She is a member of the New York and the National Women's Studies Associations, the American Psychological Association Division 35 (Psychology of Women), and the Association for Women in Psychology.

RHODA K. UNGER is Professor of Psychology at Montclair State University. She earned her B.S. at Brooklyn College and her M.A. and Ph.D. at Harvard University. At Montclair, she has directed the Women's Studies Program and the All-College Honors Program. She has taught at Northeastern University, Hofstra, New York University, and was a Fulbright senior scholar at the University of Haifa. Among her many book publications are: *Male and*

Female: Psychological Perspectives; (with others) *Women, Gender, and Social Psychology*; and (with M. Crawford) *Women and Gender: A Feminist Psychology* and *Readings on Women and Gender*. Her numerous articles have appeared in: *American Psychologist, Journal of Social Psychology, Psychology of Women Quarterly, Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, Contemporary Psychology, Sex Roles*, and *Feminism and Psychology*. She has book chapters in *Psychology is Social: Readings and Conversations in Social Psychology, Women Therapists Working with Women, Feminist Thought and the Structure of Knowledge, Personality: Theory and Research*, and *The Development of Sex Differences and Similarities in Behavior*.

Prof. Unger is a member of the editorial board of *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, and has been a guest editor for the *Newsletter of the Society for the Advancement of Social Psychology, Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, and *Sex Roles*. She has organized symposia, chaired panels, and delivered keynote addresses on themes of women and psychology every year since 1967 and has served as a consultant at Rutgers University and New York University. A Fellow of the American Psychological Association, she has chaired the Gordon Allport Award Committee of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (APA Division 9), the Task Force on the Place of Feminist Psychology in Women's Studies (APA Division 35) and has served on the Committee on Women and Minorities of the National Collegiate Honors Council.

KAREN F. WYCHE is Assistant Professor of Afro-American Studies and Education at Brown University. She earned her B.A. at Adelphi University, her M.S.W. at the University of Maryland, and her Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology at the University of Missouri, Columbia. She has also taught at Hunter College and the University of Missouri Medical School, and has been a Visiting Scholar at the Institute for Research and Gender at Stanford Univer-

Towson University, Baltimore, MD

sity. She is both a certified Psychologist and a certified Social Worker and has worked as a school Social Worker in the Baltimore City Public Schools. Her most recent publications include an edited book (with Faye J. Crosby): *Women's Ethnicities: Journeys through Psychology*; and "Conceptualization of Social Class in African American Women: Congruence of Client and Therapist Definitions," *Women and Therapy* (1996). Her numerous other articles appear in *Psychology of Women Quarterly, Contemporary Psychology*, and *Applied and Preventive Psychology*. She has contributed book chapters to *Planning to Live: Suicidal Youth in Community Settings; Ethnic Issues in Adolescent Health; Interventions for Adolescent Identity; Women of Color and the Curriculum*; and *Proceedings of the 13th Empirical Black Psychology Conference*.

Prof. Wyche is a member of the editorial board of the *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, and has served on an ad hoc basis on the editorial boards of *Sex Roles, Child Development*, and *Contemporary Psychology*. She is a member of the American Psychological Association and has been Nominations Chair of APA Division 35, Secretary-Treasurer of the Section on Black Women, Treasurer of the Section on Feminists Training and Practice, and Racism Coordinator of APA Division 9. She is a member of the Society for Research in Child Development, American Psychological Society, and American Orthopsychiatric Association. She has received grants from the National Science Foundation and the National Institute for Child Health Development.

Reader Comment

Rethinking the Disciplines: Psychology

Thank you for taking a few minutes to provide us with your response to this group of essays. If you have shared it with others, please feel free to copy this form and provide it to them.

Circle the appropriate number:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
• These essays informed me about the analysis of gender, race, and class in psychology	1	2	3	4	5
• These essays pointed out how theories, concepts, and methods have or have not changed	1	2	3	4	5
• Concepts and vocabulary were easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5
• The information in the main body of the essay was useful for course revision	1	2	3	4	5
• The references were very useful	1	2	3	4	5

How did you learn about this essay? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Publication notice
- ☐ Faculty workshop
- ☐ Conference presentation
- ☐ Internet listing
- ☐ Summer institute
- ☐ Other (what?_____)

What use did you make of the essay? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Read it for my own knowledge
- ☐ Used to revise a course
- ☐ Shared with colleagues
- ☐ Assigned as classroom reading

Please tell us something about your institution. Is it a:

- ☐ high school
- ☐ two-year college
- ☐ four-year college
- ☐ research university
- ☐ other (what?_____)

Also tell us something about yourself. Are you: (check all that apply)

- ☐ a faculty member (If so, what is your discipline of training? _____)
- ☐ a student (If so, what is your major? _____)
- ☐ an administrator
- ☐ other (what?_____)

How much formal academic training have you received in this discipline?

- ☐ none
- ☐ one or two courses as an undergraduate
- ☐ undergraduate major
- ☐ some graduate training
- ☐ master's degree training
- ☐ Ph.D. degree training

For additional comments, please write on the back of this card or attach additional pages.

Thanks!

Name:
Address:
City/State/Zip:
Phone:
Email:

TAPE HERE TAPE HERE

Comments: We would welcome additional comments. Please be specific. Write in the space below, or use additional pages if necessary. Thank you!

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

FIRST CLASS PERMIT NO. 9560 BALTIMORE, MD.

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women
Institute for Teaching and Research on Women
Towson University
Towson, MD 21252

Publications of the National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women

WOMEN IN THE CURRICULUM

The following publications consist of directories, manuals, and essays covering the primary information needed by educators to transform the curriculum to incorporate the scholarship on women. The publications have been designed to be brief, user friendly, and cross referenced to each other. They can be purchased as a set or as individual titles. Tables of contents and sample passages are available on the National Center Web page: http://www.towson.edu/ncctrw/.

➢ ***Directory of Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities in the U.S.***

The *Directory* provides brief descriptions of 237 curriculum transformation projects or activities from 1973 to the present. It is intended to help educators review the amount and kinds of work that have been occurring in curriculum transformation on women and encourage them to consult project publications (see also *Catalog of Resources*) and to contact project directors for more information about projects of particular interest and relevance to their needs.

386 pages, 8½ X 11 hardcover, $30 individuals, $45 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-07-6

➢ ***Catalog of Curriculum Transformation Resources***

The *Catalog* lists materials developed by curriculum transformation projects and national organizations that are available either free or for sale. These include proposals, reports, bibliographies, workshop descriptions, reading lists, revised syllabi, classroom materials, participant essays, newsletters, and other products of curriculum transformation activities, especially from those projects listed in the *Directory*. These resources provide valuable information, models, and examples for educators leading and participating in curriculum transformation activities.

(Available fall 1997)

➢ ***Introductory Bibliography for Curriculum Transformation***

The *Introductory Bibliography* provides a list of references for beginning curriculum transformation on women, especially for those organizing projects and activities for faculty and teachers. It does not attempt to be comprehensive but rather to simplify the process of selection by offering an "introduction" that will lead you to other sources.

15 pages, 6 x 9 paper, $7, ISBN 1-885303-32-7

➢ ***Getting Started: Planning Curriculum Transformation***

Planning Curriculum Transformation describes the major stages and components of curriculum transformation projects as they have developed since about 1980. Written by Elaine Hedges, whose long experience in women's studies and curriculum transformation projects informs this synthesis, *Getting Started* is designed to help faculty and administrators initiate, plan, and conduct faculty development and curriculum projects whose purpose is to incorporate the content and perspectives of women's studies and race/ethnic studies scholarship into their courses.

124 pages, 6 x 9 hardcover, $20 individuals, $30 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-06-8

➢ ***Internet Resources on Women: Using Electronic Media in Curriculum Transformation***

This manual gives clear, step-by-step instructions on how to use e-mail, find e-mail addresses, and access e-mail discussion lists relevant to curriculum transformation. It explains Telnet, FTP, Gopher, and the World Wide Web, and how to access and use them. It discusses online information about women on e-mail lists and World Wide Web sites. Written by Joan Korenman, who has accumulated much experience through running the Women's Studies e-mail list, this manual is a unique resource for identifying information for curriculum transformation on the Internet. Updates to this manual will be available on the World Wide Web at http://www.umbc.edu/wmst/updates.html .

130 pages, 6 x 9 hardcover, $20 individuals, $30 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-08-4

➢ ***Funding: Obtaining Money for Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities***

This manual is intended to assist educators who lack experience in applying for grants but are frequently expected to secure their own funding for projects. The manual provides an overview of the process, basic information and models, and advice from others experienced in fund raising.

150 pages,6 x 9 hardcover, $20 individuals, $30 institutions, ISBN 1-885303-05-x

➢ ***Evaluation: Measuring the Success of Curriculum Transformation***

This manual outlines several designs which could be used when assessing the success of a project. *Evaluation: Measuring the Success of Curriculum Transformation* is written by Beth Vanfossen, whose background in the teaching of research methods as well as practical experience in conducting evaluation research informs the manual's advice. Evaluation is an increasingly important component of curriculum transformation work on which project directors and others often need assistance.

(Available fall 1997)

➢ ***Discipline Analysis Essays***

Under the general editorship of Elaine Hedges, the National Center has requested scholars in selected academic disciplines to write brief essays summarizing the impact of the new scholarship on women on their discipline. These essays identify and explain the issues to be confronted as faculty in these disciplines revise their courses to include the information and perspectives provided by this scholarship. The series is under continuous development, and titles will be added as they become available. See order form for essays currently available.

27 - 60 pages, 6 x 9 paper, $7 each

➢ ***CUNY Panels: Rethinking the Disciplines***

Panels of scholars in seven disciplines address questions about the impact on their disciplines of recent scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class. The panels were developed under the leadership of Dorothy O. Helly as part of the Seminar on Scholarship and the Curriculum: The Study of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class within The CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Sciences. For this seminar CUNY received the "Progress in Equity" award for 1997 from the American Association of University Women (AAUW).

56 - 85 pages, 6 x 9 paper, $10 each

ORDER FORM 1-800-847-9922, 8:30-4:00 EST, M-F or Fax: 1-410-830-3482

National Center for Curriculum Tranformation Resources on Women
Towson University, Baltimore, MD 21252

SHIP TO:

Name _____

Institution _____

Address _____ (*no P.O. Boxes*)

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____ Fax _____ E-mail _____

All orders must be prepaid **by charging the total to a credit card by phone, fax, or mail or by enclosing a check for the total amount with the order form. No purchase orders.**

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Visa ☐ Mastercard ☐ Discover

Account # _____ Exp. Date ____/____

Signature _____

Printed Name _____

CUT HERE

WOMEN IN THE CURRICULUM

Title	Quantity	Total Cost
Complete SET of all titles listed below at 10% discount $251 set (individuals); $292 set (institutions) + $20 shipping		$
• **Directory of Projects & Activities,** Hardcover $30 (individual); $45 (institutions)		$
• **Introductory Bibliography,** Paper: $7		$
• **Getting Started,** Hardcover $20 (individual); $30 (institutions)		$
• **Internet Resources on Women,** Hardcover $20 (individual); $30 (institutions)		$
• **Funding for Projects & Activities,** Hardcover $20 (individual); $30 (institutions)		$
• **Discipline Analysis Essays,** Paper: $7 each		$

__ Anthropology __ Education __ Philosophy
__ Art __ European History __ Political Science
__ Biology __ Geography __ Psychology
__ British Literature __ Health __ Sociology
__ Composition __ Music __ U.S. History
__ Economics

• **CUNY Panels: Rethinking the Disciplines,** Paper: $10 each		$

__ Anthropology __ History __ Sociology
__ Biology __ Literature
__ Education __ Psychology

Subtotal	$
Sales Tax (MD residents add 5%)	$
Shipping/Handling (UPS, $4 first book, $1 ea. addl.)	$
TOTAL	$

Make checks payable to: **TU UNIVERSITY STORE**
Mail order to: **University Store, University Union Bldg.**
Towson University, 8000 York Rd., Baltimore, MD 21252
Phone orders: **1-800-847-9922**

Printed in USA 1997

Panels of scholars in seven disciplines address questions about the impact on their disciplines of recent scholarship on gender, race, ethnicity, and class. The panels were developed under the leadership of Dorothy O. Helly as part of the Seminar on Scholarship and the Curriculum within The CUNY Academy for the Humanities and Sciences. This series received the 1997 "Progress in Equity" award from the American Association of University Women (AAUW).

Publications available in WOMEN In the CURRICULUM series

- Directory of Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities in the U.S.
- Catalog of Curriculum Transformation Resources
- Introductory Bibliography: Basic References for Curriculum Transformation
- Getting Started: Planning Curriculum Transformation Work
- Internet Resources on Women: Using Electronic Media in Curriculum Transformation
- Funding: Obtaining Money for Curriculum Transformation Projects and Activities
- Evaluation: Measuring the Success of Curriculum Transformation
- Essays on Selected Topics and Issues
- Discipline Analysis Essays:
  - Anthropology
  - Art
  - Biology
  - British Literature
  - Composition
  - Economics
  - Education
  - European History
  - Geography
  - Health
  - Music
  - Philosophy
  - Political Science
  - Psychology
  - Sociology
  - U.S. History
- CUNY Panels: Rethinking the Disciplines
  - Anthropology
  - Biology
  - Education
  - History
  - Literature
  - Psychology
  - Sociology

National Center for Curriculum Transformation Resources on Women

Institute for Teaching and Research on Women
Towson University

ISBN 1-885303-14-9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☐ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☑ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").